

SPECTACULAR! SPECTACULAR!

Jodie Ann Hardy

Submitted to the faculty of the University Graduate School
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree
Master of Fine Arts in Visual Art and Public Life
in the Herron School of Art and Design,
Indiana University

May 2010

Spectacular! Spectacular

By
Jodie Ann Hardy
Master of Fine Arts

Herron School of Art and Design
IUPUI
Indiana University

Eric Nordgulen, Associate Professor of Sculpture
Advisor

Greg Hull, Associate Professor of Sculpture
Committee Member

R. Patrick Kinsman, Lecturer of Art History
Committee Member

Accepted: May 2010

Professor Valerie Eickmeier
Dean of Herron School of Art and Design

Date

Maslow's hierarchy of needs might be as relevant today as his theory of human motivation was in 1943 when he first published it, but even 1970's advertiser's adoption and revision of it to include the higher ranking "aesthetic and cognitive" needs don't fully account for today's apparently insatiable desire for entertainment on demand (Maslow, Chapman). We want to be stimulated – constantly. We procrastinate, ameliorate, and celebrate by plugging into spectacles large and small on screens of equally variant size and scope. We get a buzz from the buzz we foster. We are swirling in a spectacle of our own device. *We* are the tail that wags the dog.

P.T. Barnum would be proud.

This spectacle master was a genius at creating a sensation by capitalizing on the latest forms of media and technology of his time, including the thunderous railroad boon, vivid four-color printing processes and sparkling plate glass windows. Moving his circus by rail provided greater mobility to distant places, but by *owning* a train Barnum was also able to turn it into a roaring advertisement, now a common practice of city transit systems. Saturating public spaces with the audacious claims and garish colors of banner lines and posters insured his circus tents would be filled to capacity, laying the ground work for today's signage and billboard industries. His partnerships with Park Avenue merchants created sidewalk spectacles where pedestrians were awed by articulated fantasy worlds viewed through expansive picture windows, therein establishing an early training ground for Hollywood set designers in film and television.

It was this style of American spectacular entrepreneurial showmanship that melded with the well-established Parisian mercantile tradition of extravagant retail display that made way for the mid-20th Century consumer expansion ignited by the Marshall Plan in post-war France. This free enterprise hybrid raised the ire of Guy Debord and others who made up a group of writer-activists known as the *Situationist International*. The *Situs* adopted a mandate to create *situations* bent on disrupting the "self-perpetuating delusional system" of expansion and profiteering (Self).

A primary means for doing so was through graffiti. Slogans such as “*EN BAS AVEC LA SOCIÉTÉ MARCHANDISE DE SPECTACLE*” trans. “*DOWN WITH SPECTACLE-COMMODITY SOCIETY*” contributed greatly to – some claim caused – the widespread revolution among students and laborers culminating in the riots of Paris, May 1968 (Bopsecrets). The corollary American scrawled and chanted version was *DOWN WITH THE ESTABLISHMENT*, a phrase often seen and heard during protests and demonstrations reported on the CBS Evening News with Walter Cronkite. I watched these scenes in silence as an adolescent with my family at the dinner table, wondering *what’s behind all this?* Although we Baby Boomers were tagged the “Me Generation,” and have been collectively blamed for many of today’s social ills including self-absorption, insubordination and greed, we altered the cultural landscape nonetheless. We marched for civil rights and charged headlong into hedonism. We cast off convention, and put on airs. Some of us explored self-awareness, others self-destruction. Some of us “Turned-on, tuned-in, and dropped-out,” but many more of us flagship TV babies enthusiastically embraced the spectacle of commodity culture, viewing the media and advertisement industries as forms of passive entertainment and means of identity branding (Leary). Then we passed it on to our children.

Guy Debord would be appalled.

The zeitgeist of those turbulent 60’s, with its rebelliousness, freewheeling spirit, circumspect observations, and social activism, instilled in me an eye for the outrageous, overlooked, and out-of-place, as well as a determination to advocate through art in the public realm. I grew up in a small town where nearby rail yards brought into constant view streams of boxcars smeared with rebellious graffiti. In contrast, department store windows reinforced mid-western mores with displays of *appropriate* female self-representation. The circus-like fare of early television broadcasting, the flamboyance of Technicolor movies, and a limitless supply of library books where vital connections to a world beyond the rampant decay of my manufacturing mid-western locale. My world quickly became one “conceived and

grasped as a picture,” cultivated in a primordial TV soup (Heidegger 129). It’s in the context of these influences that I investigate spectacle making – and taking. I *still* want to know what’s behind it all.

After a successful professional life, I joined many of my Boomer peers by “cashing out” to pursue a dream differed – an art degree. While an undergraduate student of art history and studio fine art I researched and interpreted issues of social constructs, authority, and influence. Semiotic, feminist and fashion theory informed my work, but reading *The Invisible Flâneur* proved to be a major turning point, causing me to venture into the ambiguities of complicity and resistance, prompting me to try my hand at eliciting viewer response (Wilson). The culmination of my baccalaureate experience involved producing my first public art installation, *Sharp Donors*, where I attempted to entice viewers to participate in an illogical act of “giving.” At first they complied, then they completely hijacked it. It begged the question, how does the variability of human interaction rub against the spectacle-commodity society? *Sharp Donors* placed me within the murky realm of influence, free will, and random acts, and this query has been the driving force behind my continuous investigations into compliance with and resistance to the globalized spectacle-commodity society; I view *Sharp Donors* as a seminal work in the evolution of a public art practice that continues to look broader and deeper “behind it all.” In so doing I’m discovering an ever-expanding, ambiguous and shifty relationship between the tail and it’s dog. It’s this locus of indeterminate cause and effect that inspires, motivates and informs my work. Although situational in nature, my use of foolery, fakery and marketing ploys, differs greatly from Debord’s call for anarchy against the “falsification [that is] also the falsification of the world” (Debord, “Comments”). My spectacular falsifications are intended to reveal the authenticity of human interaction that lies beneath the surface of the flash, clamor and roar of the perpetual spectacle.

One only needs to look to Marcel Duchamp, Salvador Dali and Andy Warhol for examples of absurdist spectacle fabricating. I was able to participate in a tradition of

store window display begun by Barnum, and exploited by these surrealists, and pop artist, when the Arts Council of Indianapolis awarded a commission for the *Urban Interpretations Picture Windows Program*. *The Silent Sellers; Under Construction*, was a satirical trilogy addressing the manufacture of desire, a surrealist obsession. It furthered my investigation into the spectacle serving tools of seduction, specifically those used by the fashion industry (See *The Silent Sellers* figures 1-3 in Appendix).

Like Dorothy in the Land of Oz, I began looking behind the curtain to see who or what holds the ropes, pulls the levers and flips the switch. I researched the psychology of selling to learn the secret tactics that are used and integrated them into a public art practice. I assumed the role of marketer in the attempt to point a finger at the wizards and playbook. What began as a commentary on the machinations of fashion marketing and the social constructs that dictate canons of beauty and comportment, ended as an inquiry into “the logic of the puppeteer” (Wright 37). I no longer wanted to see who tugged the strings; I wanted to make the marionette dance myself. Or at least try.

What I’ve found most compelling about working within the space of sidewalk display windows was the chance to scramble the slippery signals that have become a part of downtown pedestrian visual culture for over a hundred years. By recontextualizing magazine advertising, retail display and spin-off toy marketing as visual merchandising cum street art, I’ve been able in the space of 100 feet of city sidewalk to question what is being communicated, what is being sold, and what constitutes a call to action, thereby scrutinizing the spectacle, spectator and spin-master. Passersby glanced, gawked and outright stopped to stare at *Silent Sellers*, from professionals working in the 48-story Chase Tower where the storefront windows were located in downtown Indianapolis, to the people on the fringe who populate the harsh nooks and crannies of the city.

After putting the finishing touches on the installation, an anonymous viewer told me he thought the 114 Barbie dolls that composed the *Toy Merchandising* windows

“were creepy, but creepy in a good kind of way” (See Detail; *Toy Merchandising* figure 4 in Appendix).

News reports and editorials either praised the work for its sophistication or accused it of addressing “timeworn themes” (Hoppe). Various online commentaries regarding content, incentive and effect ranged from superficial to astute. *Silent Sellers* was an important contributor to developing my skills at manipulating cultural codes, capturing viewer’s attention and generating debate.

My next step was to literally remove the glass that separates the work from the audience. A commission awarded by Community Hospital North of Indianapolis to grace the newly renovated entry drive and pavilion did just that; glass merely serves as an architectural backdrop and is no longer a barrier to viewing *Close-up*, a freestanding steel and wood sculpture. The kinetic movement and multiple free-hanging angular forms were designed to complement the hospital’s curvilinear architectural design as the sculpture conceptually interrogates the medical practices of examination and evaluation (See *Close-up* figure 5 in Appendix).

Like the actor who takes the stage with his character’s secret informing the delivery of each line, my inspiration for *Close-up* was electron microscopy imaging of nerve vessels and a human hair, and my secret motivation a series of personal observations of the healthcare industry. In *Close-up*, I stripped away the body politic of class, race and gender that can elevate, discriminate or marginalize, to highlight our biological similarities. I attempted to avoid cultural cues as I pondered the marketing tactics employed by hospital executives to cultivate a patient clientele. I marveled at the hotel-esque amenities, such as valet parking, and continue to wonder if the suburban new parent market really demands elegant hardwood-paneled suites for childbirth. I buried these queries beneath several layers of lavishly applied paint, and sincerely hope that the undulating shapes and bold application of vivid hues will engage patients, visitors, and staff. I may never know if anyone will see the irony in the appropriation of an exorbitantly expensive and

inordinately exclusive means of photographing – and scrutinizing – the human body, and its recontextualization through enlargement to gigantic proportions, using only the simplest of old-school sign painter’s methods and materials. There, in the gargantuan proportions and the sliced deconstruction of the microscopy imagery I’ve offered an alternative perspective at the spectacular achievements and complexities of the health care industry.

Although I primarily focused on formal concerns to create a piece pleasing to the eye, the work is also a personal reflection of my connection to the medical field; to my grandfather the surgeon, to the fear associated with being without health insurance as a single mother, and to the tragedy of facilitating my mother’s and sister-in-law’s procedural passing from fatal brain aneurisms. The only visual reference to the spectacle-commodity society in *Close-up* is to the long lost tradition of hand-painted signage, and to the wonder of medical imaging itself. Questions of how the technology is used, who has access to it and how it is funded is present only subliminally. It’s purely coincidental that this 3 year temporary installation runs concurrent with the public debate American’s are conducting concerning healthcare reform.

I classify *Sharp Donors*, *Silent Sellers* and *Close-up* no differently from art hung in a gallery, because the works are experienced in fixed locations. The video *Bruit de Pas* transl. *Sound of Steps* was my first attempt at creating public work that exists outside of the well-established venues of gallery, museum or out of doors. *Bruit de Pas* probes the intimacy of individual experience when interacting with small personal electronic media, specifically laptops and smart phones. I began with spontaneous filming of my own feet shod and barefoot to allude to the various facets of one’s self that are concealed and/or revealed publicly and/or privately. Images of simple everyday activities conducted in public, such as walking and shopping, are juxtaposed with ambiguous action that alludes to the things we do when no one else is around. I’ve illustrated William Rossi’s notions of “podo-erotica” to demonstrate how an inanimate object often serves to vicariously fulfill one’s deepest desires, and

can keep one's darkest secrets (Rossi). These psychological "truths" are skillfully played upon in seductive advertising imagery. By placing the video in the virtual venue of YouTube I have positioned it amongst the work of other artists, such as that of Rosemarie Trockel who challenges hegemony, as well as pitting it against slick commercials, banal instructionals, and obscure miscellany (See *Bruit de Pas* figure 6 in Appendix). I was less concerned with using YouTube as an archive as some artists do, or having it "go viral," as is the objective of exhibitionists and viral producers, than in the voyeuristic act of viewing videos in the intimacy of one's own hand or lap.

YouTube makes spectacle production and consumption egalitarian. Most popular "views" range from Mommy's home videos of babies chortling to Lady Gaga's spectacle churning *Bad Romance*, which to date has had over 170 million hits (Lady Gaga). Anyone can upload footage, track the watching of it, read anonymous commentary, respond, replay, and forward it to others. There's unlimited opportunity for glory and humiliation in this public realm. Publishing *Bruit de Pas* in a virtual venue was another critical juncture in the trajectory leading toward the launching of *Spectacular! Spectacular!* It's precisely this dynamic field of interaction, with its vagaries, complexity, and hidden meanings that makes it a predominant conceptual aspect of *Spectacular! Spectacular!*

To further a practice of spectacle sleuthing via public art, my current work parallels the mobility of Barnum's circus, the covert bully pulpit of graffiti, and the populism of YouTube. *Spectacular! Spectacular!* investigates spectacle commodity culture by appropriating advertising methodology and absurdly inserting it in a dense urban setting with an emphasis on the variability of human interaction. *Spectacular! Spectacular!* is conceived to explore the relationship that exists between the viewer and the viewed, the spectacle and spectator. It does so by exploiting the ambiguous intersections of art and advertising, participation and refusal, commerce and largess. It will reveal its own truths, in spite of the fabrication it implies.

“Creative without strategy is called ‘art.’ Creative with strategy is called ‘advertising.”

- Jef I. Richards (qut. in Griffin 59)

Contemporary critical art practices are scrutinized for their pertinence and innovation, and hold distinction above other creative endeavors that are ranked lower in the ineffable hierarchy of creative recognition. Gauging an artist’s position amongst predecessors and peers falls squarely within the purview of curators and critics. The determination by “experts” regarding the unspoken caste system that defines whether one is labeled an artist, craftsman, or hobbyist, may seem rigid and unforgiving, but the distinctions are far less clear than meets the eye. Consider the runaway hit TV series *Mad Men*, which pays homage to 1960’s advertising culture. The show depicts a group of characters launching into the unknown territory of television advertising at a time when Debord’s rhetoric and *Situationist* activity was heating up in direct response. Although episodes of *Mad Men* are researched extensively for visual and historical accuracy, it’s the lead man, Don Draper’s sordid past and intuitive brilliance that drives the storyline and bolsters the myth that the adman is a secretive tortured genius. A myth also perpetuated regarding artists. Both adman and artist are interchangeably referred to as *Creatives*. *Creative* in advertising is centered on selling a product or service. Teams of executives, designers, writers, account managers and administrators strategize to create a call to action that will result in increased revenues for the client and the firm. *Creative* in art also often strategizes to amplify visibility in the effort to “sell” to an “audience.” Artists too may form teams to collaborate with other artists, designers, fabricators, installers and exhibitors to achieve a calculated end. Contemporary art is rarely considered successful outside of the ability of the people who comprise the *industry of art* to authenticate, replicate or promote it for a considerable percentage skimmed off the top. *Creative* in advertising and art are dependent upon devising a strategy and executing it to be viable, making them both an integral part of the spectacle-commodity society. *Spectacular! Spectacular!* is situated within the grey area that exists between these seemingly disparate genres of art and advertising, circumventing strategy altogether.

Marketing strategy exists for no other reason than to generate revenues for the organizations that enable it to exist, or to shore up the positions of those in power. The spectacle exists as a function to feed the perceived needs of an aspiration oriented society, needs that have been constructed for the purposes of manufacturing desire or perpetuating the “institution of insecurity” (Bourdieu 29). Barnumian tactics, including compelling slogans, fanciful graphics, vivid colors, outlandish forms and dynamic movement, form the bedrock of this seduction. Catching the eye, capturing the imagination, leaving enough unsaid for the viewer to fill in the blanks with their own associations and unrequited desires – or unspoken fears – are part of the “omnipresent visibility” of the spectacle-making machine (Baudrillard, “Ecstasy” 19). This presence, called branding, clamors for complicity and compliance, telling us to be, do, or get something. Much of it works, but apathy and outright refusal are forms of response that propels the client and his adman to devise ever more sophisticated and insidious forms of spectacle fabrication. What if the adman and the artist were one in the same with no tickets to sell, trinkets to peddle or sideshows to hawk? What if there was nothing but a nonsensical object that puts the handle of the spectacle in the hand of the spectator? What if the only reason for this object to exist was to question its very existence? *Spectacular!* *Spectacular!* is meant to do just that, and it began with a prop – and a sign.

Spectacular! Spectacular! is an experimental public art project released into the hands of the people on the sidewalks of Los Angeles, New York, and a third undisclosed location. Three identical *Give Wagons* are adorned with one simple call to action, “Take it On! Give it Up!” (See *Spectacular! Spectacular! Give Wagon* figure 7 in Appendix). My inquiry is rooted in a curiosity regarding the participation level of the public, from the simple act of pulling a wagon, to the act of giving it to another, to the role of paparazzi, Internet voyeur, and any other unpredictable roles played by the public at large. I’ve embedded within *Spectacular! Spectacular!* a number of cultural cues, by appropriating American advertising and circus iconography. I’ve provided ample opportunity for direct access to the public to respond to the work.

A posted web address enables participants and bystanders to upload photographs and video of their interaction with, or their observations of *Give Wagon* activity. GPS tracking devices in each allow for web access to watch the trail of the wagon's travel from person to person, place to place. Web blogging and commentary provide a forum for debate to anyone who chooses. Rather than puppeteer, I'm the builder of the set, who's opened the curtains to allow the "actors" to take the stage on the sidewalks of the city.

The semiotic sign languages that informed the design of the *Give Wagon* was inspired by early 20th century circus wagons, medieval processional wagons, Hindu festival carts, and the extravagant parade floats of Mardi Gras. The wagons are intended to mimic the sacred and secular spectacles that historically have been put into service by authority to reinforce ideology, by community to congregate and celebrate, and by commerce to drum up sales. Constructed of the same sign-painter's board as *Close-up*, each is scaled to human proportions, and is easily pulled behind like a child's little red wagon on rubber wheels. Their shape is devised to intrigue, invite curiosity and prompt interaction. I've integrated the arcs and serifs that echo Dr. Seuss and Japanese anime, calling upon that same odd combination of whimsy and menace (Fig. 8).

These odd little cabinets on wheels wield a perplexing incongruity; they seem to be in the service of selling something, but offer no goods to purchase or perceived tangible reward. They are exchanged, but not in service of the marketplace, only in the realm of the gift economy, as "gifts in motion" (Hyde). They are experiments in the relationships that are mediated by forces beyond spectacle-commodity culture. They are sidewalk Petri dishes for what Baudrillard called

the cargo myth [which] continues to be experience as a daily miracle, in so far as it does not appear to be something produced and extracted, something won after historical or social effort, but something dispensed by a beneficent mythological agency to which we are the legitimate heirs ("Consumer" 37).

The *Give Wagons* now have a life of their own to reveal what the “heirs” do with this enigmatic cargo that functions outside of the marketplace. Will they treat it as a miracle or a threat, as art or as booty, with interest or indifference? Will people “take on” the wagons in a way that inspires a responsibility for giving them to others, or will the dark underbelly of city life reveal a different outcome as a form of refusal? Disregard, destruction, abandonment, avoidance, seizure, are all possibilities in an urban setting where task oriented people might be too distracted by their obligations, hoodlums too tempted by the opportunity for raucous behavior, the police too concerned with a concealed threat, the homeless too wary of incarceration for suspicion of some unknown possession – or could bring unwanted attention – or any number of other unforeseen forms of demise. They are out of my hands. I simply released them to encounter any of the “countless tiny deportations” that the city has to offer (Certeau 103). Only time will tell the tale of these whimsical vessels.

Another way in which the *Give Wagons* are activated is via a viewer’s curiosity to peek behind the six cabinet doors located on each side. Debord claimed “the spectacle is not a collection of images; [but] a social relation between people that is mediated by images” (Soundtrack). Each *Give Wagon* houses a collection of images behind cabinet doors that reference art and history, entertainment, sports and news media, pop and advertising culture. All were blatantly appropriated for ease of recognition: logos, movie stills and photos relate to the iconography created and disseminated by spectacle-commodity culture. In so doing I’m interrogating the freewheeling expedient adoption of pop culture as a means to an end by advertising and industry. Background images were converted into bitmap form reminiscent of photos, comic strips and advertisements printed daily in the once almighty, now nearly dead newspaper. Superimposed upon the backgrounds are flat stencil images that mimic current streamlined forms produced by the signage industry (See *Give Wagon Cabinet Images* Fig 9-10 in Appendix).

These compilations allow the viewer to make their own free associations. The pairings have been chosen to draw attention to cliché, stereotype and the instant visual language of signage, however obscure. The cabinet's "signs" are meant to generate a dialogue among viewers, and symbolically serve as mediator – and reveler – of the social relations between people. The authenticity that is revealed in my fantastical fabrication, is in the way the public responds to the call for action, interacts with the object in the city, with one other in the exchange, with their personal electronic devices in the visual capture and release, and with the broader virtual public through YouTube. Of course Barnum would suggest more whistles and bells, Debord demand a revival of his shriveled youth rebellion, Baudrillard insist on a megaphone for one and all, but I choose to answer the call of Bourdieu "to give *symbolic force*, by way of artistic form, to critical ideas and analyses" (25). My way was to take it on, then give it up (See *Give Wagon Poster Façade* figure 11 in Appendix). I may be the one behind *Spectacular! Spectacular!* yet it exists exclusively in the public's hand. It's their tale to tell. Their dog to wag. Or not.

Works Cited

Baudrillard, Jean. The Consumer Society; Myths and Structures. Trans. Chris Turner. London: Sage, 1998. Print.

---. The Ecstasy of Communication. Trans. Bernard and Caroline Schutze. New York: Columbia, 1988. Print.

Bopsecrets.org. 8. Apr. 2010. <http://www.bopsecrets.org/CF/graffiti.htm>

Bourdieu, Pierre. Firing Back Against the Tyranny of the Market 2. Trans. Loic Wacquant. New York: New Press, 2003. Print.

Certeau, Michel de. The Practice of Everyday Life. Trans. Steven Rendall. Berkeley: UC, 1984. Print.

Chapman, Alan. . "Adapted 7 Level Hierarchy of Needs Diagram Based on Maslow's Theory" *Businessballs.com*. 2001. Web. 28 Feb. 2010.

Debord, Guy. Comments on Society of the Spectacle. Trans. NotBored! Aug. 2005. Web. 16 Mar. 2010. <http://www.notbored.org/commentaires.html>

---. Film Soundtrack from Society of the Spectacle. Trans. Ken Knabb. 2003. 16 Mar. 2010. <http://www.bopsecrets.org/SI/debord.films/spectacle.htm>.

Griffin, Tim. "Art and Agency." *Artforum*. Oct. ∞: 59. Print.

Heidegger, Martin. Trans. William Lovitt. The Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays. New York: Harper, 1977. Print.

Hoppe, David. "Under Construction." *Nuvo.net*. NUVO. 30 Dec. 2008. Web. 3 Jan. 2009.

Hyde, Lewis. "The Gift." Butler University, Indianapolis. 25 Feb. 2004. Lecture.

Lady Gaga. "Bad Romance." Interscope, 2009. YouTube. Web. 5 Apr. 2010.

Leary, Timothy. "Turn On, Tune In, Drop Out." ESP: 1027. 1066. Sound Recording.

Maslow, Abraham H. "A Theory of Human Motivation." *Psychological Review*. 50 (1943): 370-396. Print.

Rossi, William A. The Sex Life of the Foot and Shoe. London: Routledge, 1977. Print.

Self, Will. "Living with Dead Time." Rev. of *The Game of War: the Life and Death of Guy Debord* by Andrew Hussey. *New Statesman* 27 Aug. 2001. Web. 18 Mar. 2010.

Wilson, Elizabeth. "The Invisible Flâneur." *New Left Review*. 1/191 (1992): 90-110.

Wright, Robert. The Moral Animal: Evolutionary Psychology and Everyday Life. New York: Vintage, 1995. Print.

Appendix



Fig 1. *The Silent Sellers – Under Construction; Fashion Centerfold*. Window 1 of 3. 8' h. x 17' w. x 4' d. Chase Tower, Pennsylvania Street façade. Indianapolis, Indiana. October 2008 – May 2009.



Fig 2. *The Silent Sellers – Under Construction; Visual Merchandising*. Window 2 of 3. 8' h. x 17' w. x 4' d. Chase Tower, Pennsylvania Street façade. Indianapolis, Indiana. October 2008 – May 2009.



Fig 3. *The Silent Sellers – Under Construction; Toy Merchandising.* Window 3 of 3. 8' h. x 17' w. x 4' d. Chase Tower, Pennsylvania Street façade. Indianapolis, Indiana. October 2008 – May 2009.



Fig 4. Detail: *Toy Merchandising Window.*



Fig 5. *Close-up*. Public art commission awarded by Community Hospital North, Indianapolis. Temporary installation; 2010-2013. Dimensions; 17' h. x 30' w. x 4' – 6" d.



Fig 6. *Bruit de Pas*. Filmed, performed and edited by Jodie Hardy. Music "Rip It" by Justin DeCloedt. 2009. YouTube Video.



Fig 7. *Spectacular! Spectacular! Give Wagon*. Wood, steel, paint, screen-printing. GPS tracking unit. 72" h. x 47" w. x 28" d.



Fig. 9. *Give Wagon Cabinet Images*. Screen-printing on Masonite.



Fig. 10. *Give Wagon Cabinet Images*. Screen-printing on Masonite.



Fig. 11. *Give Wagon Poster Façade*. Screen-printing on plywood.

Jodie Hardy
2671 Hill View Ln.
St. Joseph, MI 49085
Cell Phone: 317-417-0581
E-mail: jodie@jodiehardy.com

Curriculum Vitae

Bio

- Born: Mishawaka, Indiana, 1955.
- Graduate: American Floral Art School, Chicago, Illinois. 1975. Floral Designer, Mishawaka, Indiana. 1973-1990.
- Founder/owner: Aesthetics, Inc., Goshen, Indiana. Full-service interior design and decorative arts commissions. 1990-99.
- Becomes full-time student at age 45 pursuing BFA Costume Design, Indiana University. South Bend, Indiana. 2000-2002.
- Begins freelance costume design and stage make-up design career.
- Moves to Indianapolis, interrupting degree to accept position as costume shop assistant manager, Indiana Repertory Theatre, Indianapolis, Indiana. 2002-2003.
- Returns to school full-time at Herron School of Art and Design, Indiana University, Indianapolis, Indiana. 2003-2006. Graduates with High Distinction, Bachelor of Arts: Major; Art History, Minors; BFA concentrations in sculpture, textiles and theatre.
- Serves as Art Center Director, SullivanMunce Cultural Center. Zionsville, Indiana. Responsible for curating exhibits, developing educational programming and fundraising activities. 2007.
- Founding board member, Zionsville Arts Initiative, a nonprofit organization dedicated to nurturing the arts through exhibits, events and artist services. 2007 – present.
- Advisory committee member, Zionsville Town Council. Working to define a public art ordinance that allows for the placement of murals and sculpture within Zionsville town limits. 2007 – 2008.
- MFA in Visual art and Public Life; Herron School of Art and 2010.

Exhibit History

- *Community Hospital North*, Commission for public art project to be installed Spring 2010.
- *The Silent Sellers: Under Construction*, Arts Council of Indianapolis Urban Interpretations Exhibit, Chase Tower. Pennsylvania St., Indianapolis, Indiana. October 2008 – May, 2009.
- *Time Tables and Other Fables*; Marsh Gallery, Herron School of Art and Design, Indianapolis, Indiana. September 19-27, 2008.
- *Women's Caucus for the Arts Regional Exhibit*, Women Made Gallery, Chicago, Illinois. September, 2008.

- *ReCouture Exhibit and Runway Show*, Harrison Center for the Arts. Indianapolis, Indiana. May, 2008.
- *Poppin' Pills*, Artlink Contemporary Art Gallery. Ft. Wayne, Indiana. January, 2008.
- *Self-Portrait Exhibit*, Artlink Contemporary Art Gallery. Ft. Wayne, Indiana. December, 2007.
- *Story Book Stilettos, Inaugural Exhibit; Zionsville Arts Initiative Art & Spaces Program*. Robert Goodman Jewelers. Zionsville, Indiana. December 2007 – February 2008.
- *Fiber Expressions*, Indianapolis Art Center. Indianapolis, Indiana. July – September, 2007.
- *Indy Visual Fringe*, Lockerbie Methodist Church. Indianapolis, Indiana. August-September, 2007.
- *Herron Juried Student Exhibit*, Herron School of Art and Design. Indianapolis, Indiana. May, 2006, December, 2003.
- *Textile Exhibit*, SOFA Gallery, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana. May 2005.
- *Midwest Peace Summit Exhibit*, IUPUI Cultural Arts Gallery. Indianapolis, Indiana. First Prize. March, 2005.
- *War Today*, School House 30. Indianapolis, Indiana. March, 2005.
- *Resurrection*, Washington Street Gallery. Goshen, Indiana. March 2001.
- *World Appeal for Peace*, The Hague. May, 1999.

Curatorial History

- *ReCouture* (sculpture, textiles, collage); Harrison Center for the Arts, Gallery Two. Indianapolis, Indiana. May, 2008.
- *Hyper-View; Susan Fleck and Dan Annarino* (photography, oils); SullivanMunce Cultural Center. Zionsville, Indiana. October, 2007.
- *Alan Patrick and Carol Strock-Wasson* (oils, pastels), SullivanMunce Cultural Center. Zionsville, Indiana. September, 2007.
- *Arlyne Springer and Dee Schaad* (intaglio prints, ceramics); SullivanMunce Cultural Center, Zionsville, Indiana. August, 2007.
- *World of Beauty; Robert Eberle and Gene LaRue* (watercolor, oils); SullivanMunce Cultural Center. Zionsville, Indiana. July, 2007.
- *Goshen College Senior Exhibit*, (drawings, pastels, acrylics, oils, ceramics); Washington Street Gallery. Goshen, Indiana. May, 2001.
- *Resurrection* (sculpture, textiles, ceramics); Washington Street Gallery. Goshen, Indiana. March 2000.
- *Scholastic Art Awards* (drawings, pastels, acrylics, oils, ceramics); Old Bag Factory. Goshen, Indiana. January, 1999.
- *Artist's Round Table First Annual Exhibit* (drawings, pastels, acrylics, oils, ceramics, sculpture); LaCasa Habitat for Humanity Community Center. Goshen, Indiana. September, 1996.
- *Face to Face with Art & Architecture; Exploring Main Street's Upper Levels as Live/Work Spaces for Creative Professionals* (all mediums); various downtown locations. Goshen, Indiana. July, 1995.

Awards

- Ada Broadbent Sculpture Scholarship, 2006.
- Lois and Sidney Eskenazi Scholarship, 2006.
- Art History Honors Fellowship, 2005.
- Theodore Thelander Award for Best Historical Research Essay, *Nana; a Portrait of Artifice and Ambiguity in 19th – Century Paris*. 2005.
- McNeil Undergraduate Research Opportunity Grant for overseas research. Paris, Lyon and Romans, France. March, 2005.
- Louise Fulton/ Indianapolis Museum of Art Scholarship, 2005-2006.
- William H. Bartlett Memorial Scholarship, 2005-2006.

Presentations

- Panelist; *Women in Transition*. Indiana Commission for Women. November 6, 2009. Inlow Hall, IUPUI.
- Artist Lecture; *What's Behind the Silent Sellers?* Arts Council of Indianapolis. Women's History Month Closing Lecture Series. March 30, 2009. Basile Auditorium, Herron School of Art and Design.
- Presenter; *The State of the Dress; A Historical and Critical Approach to Women Artists' Use of the Dress as Sculptural Object and Performance Media*. Indiana University 18th Annual Intercampus Women's Studies/Gender Studies Conference. April 2006.